DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 506 PS 003 418

AUTHOR	Harrison, Frederica; Thogerson, Ann
TITLE	A Parent-Child Center, November-December 1968.
INSTITUTION	Duke Univ., Durham, N.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 68
NOTE	25p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Environment, *Cognitive Development, *Culturally Disadvantaged, Educational Improvement, *Language Development, Mother Attitudes, *Parent Child Relationship, Parent Participation, Parent Teacher Cooperation, *Preschool Programs

ABSTRACT

A Parent-Child Center Program was designed to test the theory that a major cause of a disadvantaged child's academic problems is the lack of proper maternal support. The 10 subjects for this study of program effectiveness were black, without husbands, and each had a 1 1/2 to 3-year-old child. Mothers met twice a week for 6 weeks in a 2-part program that focused (1) on their children's language development and (2) on their own development in child rearing, cooking and sewing skills. A preschool teacher gave instructions on how to stimulate children's language development and motivation to learn through appropriate use of day-to-day experiences. Group discussions were encouraged at these meetings. The children had a special program, too, that was intended to provide experiences in an environment that fostered cognitive, perceptual, and language development. The program took place in a well-equipped kindergarten room and was based on children's need for order and predictability, an alternating pace, mediated experiences, a sense of success and a general language facility. Measures taken of both mothers and children provided description of subjects, program evaluation, and evaluation of the measuring instruments used. The program activities were judged to be appropriate for the subjects. (MH)

ED042506

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Parent-Child Center, November-December 1968

Frederica Harrison and Ann Thogerson

Duke University

Recent research with parents and children of low socio-economic status has suggested that culturally deprived children often have retarded language development and grow up in an environment where experiences are not given order or significance by a mediator. These deficiencies of language development and of order placed on experiences have direct implications for cognitive development. The key person structuring a child's early environment is his mother: she teaches her child language and mediates his experiences. Her skill as teacher can have a significant influence on her child's development. Several programs have turned to her in their attempts to arrest a recurring cycle of cognitive deficits among children of low socio-economic status (Gray and Miller, 1966; Weikart and Lambie, 1967; Gordon, 1968; Levenstein and Sunley, 1968). Many lower class parents are unable to demonstrate the same capacity as their middle class peers for identifying with and supporting their children's education. Their own personal deficits and needs make it difficult for them to provide adequate models for learning. Chilman (1966) urged that programs be designed for these parents to help them fulfill their own needs. Based on these considerations, the Durham Education Improvement Program's Social Service Component conducted an exploratory short-term Parent-Child Center study to determine what factors are significant in designing a program to meet some educational needs of mothers and children.

PS003418

Plan of Study

Subjects were recruited from the Durham Departments of Public Welfare, Public Health, and Public Housing. The criteria for selection were mothers who were without husbands in the home and who had one pre-school child between the age of 1 1/2 and 3 years. They also had to be available for participation on a Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday between the hours of 1:00 and 4:30 p.m. That was the time that the classrooms used for the Center's operation were available for use. An arbitrary decision was made to select this group of parents to work with. The decision was based upon beliefs derived through social work observations that this particular population of mothers was in need of extra assistance in rearing their children because of the many demands implicit in their roles as deprived single parents. They appeared unaware of the resources available to them for stimulating their preschool children's interest in learning.

The goals of the program were to help mothers develop greater awareness of their role as teachers of language to their preschool children; and second, to help mothers learn specific skills that were personally rewarding; and third, to offer a short nursery experience to the children. Goals were to be achieved by having mothers replicate activities learned at the Center and experiment with newly gained ideas in their homes. The Center was operated three days a week for three hours a day over a five-week period. Separate sessions were held for mothers and children. The children's program was planned to stimulate perceptual, conceptual, and language development. The mother's program offered the opportunity

to learn about child rearing and to extend cooking and sewing skills. During the recruitment phase, the mothers indicated that these activities would be meaningful and interesting to them. The underlying assumption was that if they were provided opportunities for valued learning, they might be inclined to work with their children at home with a more positive attitude.

Plans called for pre- and post-evaluations on the mothers and children. Six measures were selected for use:

> The Environmental Participation Index (Mathis, 1967), which is a check list of objects and activities designed to estimate the relative exposure an individual has had to common middle class experiences and environmental stimulation. It focuses on the individual rather than his class membership.
>
> The Caldwell Inventory of Home Stimulation (1966), which was designed to sample certain aspects of the quantity and in some ways, the quality of social, emotional, and cognitive stimulation available to a young child within his home.
>
> The Vocabulary Sub-test of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (1955) was given to mothers; these scores were to be correlated with the children's scores on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.
>
> The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Dunn, 1965) was given to the children. For those children who were not able to score on the Peabody, a modified version of this technique was utilized. It involved naming objects placed before them, i.e., a truck, car, etc.
>
> The language elicited from each child during a home visit was rated on The Language Development Check List (Schaeffer, 1965). This developmental list contains 44 descriptive categories of language usage, from "vocalized sound syllables" through sentence structure and length, to use of "superlatives and irregular plurals of a noun."
>
> The mothers' teaching styles were studied with the use of A Behavior Classification of Teacher's Verbal and Non-Verbal Interaction (Wasik, 1968). This was the only instrument used as a post-test measure.

Three purposes were served by the above measures: description of subjects, evaluation of the program, and evaluation of the instruments for their use in similar programs.

Recruitment

The Durham Departments of Health, Welfare, and the Housing Authority were contacted by EIP Social Service staff members. The goals of the Center were discussed and clarified. They were requested to refer their clients according to the study criteria. Prior to referral, the referring person was to discuss the Parent-Child Center and determine whether or not a given client was interested and motivated to participate. Once a name was given, an EIP staff person followed up with greater detail about the program. Following this, subsequent interviews were arranged to complete pre-test evaluations and to take the mother and her child to the Center to familiarize them with the setting and the staff. Plans called for the identification of 15 mother/child pairs. Sixty people were referred by the various departments contacted. The majority of those referred did not agree to participate. With the identification of 10 pairs, the referral list was exhausted. The following reasons were given for their not participating: plans to return to work; part-time employment; plans to move into a new apartment; plans to return to school; pregnancies and poor health of mothers, and no interest in participation. Additionally, some were ruled out by the writers because their children were too old to participate. Some were unable to participate at the time the Center was in operation.

Those individuals who appeared lacking in interest were a special case. They rarely said, "No, I do not want to participate." Instead, staff recruiters were told "Yes," and then appointments were broken that were set up for a visit to the Center. Others would have "business" that interfered with their ability to be available for an interview, but they would assure the interviewer that they would like to be in the program. A few people refused to answer their doors. Others simply changed their minds after having expressed an interest. One can speculate about various reasons for this evasiveness, but perhaps it is sufficient to say that one might anticipate similar experiences in attempting to recruit from a similar population.

Characteristics of Mothers Recruited

Each mother was a school dropout. Their education ranged from 7 to 11 completed grades. The main source of income for the group was public assistance; two were employed on a part-time basis. Five were single and five were separated from their husbands. Seven lived in public housing apartments and three in slum houses. All were Negro and ranged in age from 18 to 35 years.

Interpretation of the performance of the subjects on the Environmental Participation Index was based on published raw score norms. Empirically derived norms are available for persons in urban areas of the United States who were born during the years 1939 through 1948. Other methodologies for interpreting data have been offered but this means seemed to be the most appropriate for the very small group studied. An item-by-item inspection of items revealed no significant information.

PS 003418

According to the manual of interpretation, the P score (possessions) reflects the richness of the home environment and is therefore somewhat of a passive and contextual factor, and does not bear directly on the subject's initiative, interests, attitudes and motivation. The A score (activities) is based on what the subject has actually done, and is hence more indicative of internal and/or drive forces acting upon the subject. Whereas seven individuals fell below average on the possessions score, the group was split in half on the activity score. Five were in the disadvantaged category and five were average and above. On this score, as well as on the total scores, the group appeared composed of two distinct subgroups, the disadvantaged and those of average experience. Considering that this index proposes to estimate the relative exposure an individual has had to middle class stimuli, perhaps the composition of the group was a factor that influenced the subsequent rate of attendance and the degree of cohesion observed in the group. Perhaps the group was too incompatible with regard to these variables (see Table 1).

Data Collection

The Caldwell Inventory of Home Stimulation was administered by conducting a prearranged interview in the home of each subject during a time when the child was awake. The scoring of the schedule is dependent upon both the observations of the worker and answers given by the mother. Interpretation of the subject's performance on the inventory was based solely on the performance of the group. A comparison was made of their responses to the various sub-categories. Table 2 presents performance of subjects on this inventory.

Table 1

Subject Performance on the

Environmental Participation Index (EPI)

EPI - Possessions	Total
19-20 High Advantaged	0
16-18 Advantaged	1
13-15 Average	2
9-12 Disadvantaged	6
0- 8 High Disadvantaged	1
	10

EPI - Activities	Total
42-48 High Advantaged	0
35-41 Advantaged	1
26-34 Average	4
16-25 Disadvantaged	5
0-15 High Disadvantaged	0
	10

EPI - Total Score	Total
60-68 High Advantaged	0
50-59 Advantaged	1
40-49 Average	4
30-39 Disadvantaged	4
0-29 High Disadvantaged	1
	10

Table 2

Subject Performance on the

Caldwell Inventory of Home Stimulation

NAME	I[1]	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	TOTAL
Mrs. P. Brooks	6	6	8	8	6	3	5	4	46
Mrs. S. Camp	2	7	7	5	4	5	7	7	44
Mrs. M. Holmes	4	9	8	6	3	6	6	4	46
Miss M. Mason	5	10	7	5	3	2	3	4	39
Miss D. Parks	5	5	6	5	5	4	5	2	37
Miss E. Peach	4	8	6	5	5	8	9	5	50
Miss V. Taylor	4	8	7	7	3	7	9	8	53
Mrs. B. Wilson	6	9	8	8	6	7	8	7	59
Mrs. D. Lawson	6	5	1	5	4	4	4	3	32
Miss A. Miller	1	3	2	3	4	3	6	3	25
TOTAL	43	70	60	57	43	49	62	47	431

[1]Item identification:

I = Frequency of Adult Stability
II = Developmental & Vocal Stimulation
III = Need Gratification
IV = Emotional Climate
V = Avoidance of Restriction
VI = Breadth of Experience
VII = Aspect of Physical Environment
VIII = Play Material

The group as a whole scored highest on the Developmental and Vocal Stimulation scale. Taking the high group performance at face value, one might conclude that the focus of the Parent-Child Center Program was appropriate. If the participants were indeed providing as much stimulation as indicated, then the efforts focused on developing greater awareness of the impact they were having took advantage of resources that were immediately available. However, interviewers were of the impression that while there was a lot of talk in the home, it was not purposeful and focused in a manner that was advantageous to the children. The total possible group score for that particular category was 120. Thus, assuming the Inventory to be comprehensive, the group as a whole was doing about 50% of what they might have done in order to provide a more stimulating home situation. The usefulness of the Caldwell Inventory for the Parent-Child Center was considered to be that of providing direction for program planning, as indicated above. It seemed advantageous to begin with areas in which a group of parents felt they were performing well, and then move to the areas in which they indicated less confidence. The latter would probably be more threatening, and a greater resistance to the acceptance of new ideas might be expected.

The Vocabulary Sub-test of the WAIS was given to the mothers to determine if there was any correlation between their scores and those of their children on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. The mothers' performances indicated that they were all functioning at or below the average level. The Picture Peabody Test could not be administered to eight children because they were not able to attend to the examiner, the test book, nor the objects used as substitutes for the pictures

in the book. This precluded any correlation of the WAIS scores with the Peabody scores.

The Language Development Check List was used in the home to gain an impression of the children's language expression and comprehension. One child evidenced average language ability and the remainder were below average. Each remained silent during the time the preschool teacher was in the home, in spite of having been in contact with the teacher one or two times before.

The mothers' teaching styles were evaluated with an instrument entitled A Behavioral Classification of Teachers' Verbal and Non-verbal Interaction. For the pre-test mothers were told to instruct their children in the completion of a form board from the Stanford-Binet Kit. For the post-test they were asked to instruct their children to stack colored rings on a spindle according to diameter - from largest on the bottom to smallest on the top. The data acquired proved to be unacceptable as a basis for evaluation of changes in teaching styles because there were large discrepancies between the data recorded by two technicians; the time elapsed in the two sessions was not equivalent (average pre-test time was 3 minutes and average post-test time was 10 minutes) and the final test was found to be too difficult.

Discussion of Parent-Child Operation

The Center began operating November 4, 1968, and continued each Monday and Wednesday for a 2 1/2 hour period through December 18, 1968. Classrooms in the demonstration school of the Education Improvement Program were used after regular school hours between 2:00 and 4:30 p.m.

Of necessity, transportation was provided to all participants. They came from distances too far from the Center to walk. The program was implemented by a preschool teacher, a social worker, home economist and three teacher aides. The same basic plan was generally followed each day. Deviations from the plan took place according to the needs of mothers and children. As they arrived, mothers left their children with teacher aides in the nursery classroom where activities were planned for the children. Some were eager to play and others expressed discomfort by crying, by silence, and refusal to become involved in the activities. Mothers were free to go into the nursery or to observe the children through an observation window. Sometimes teachers brought the children to their mothers.

Mothers participated in a two-part program which focused first on their children's language development, and secondly on their own interest. During the first half hour, the preschool teacher gave a brief presentation on how they could purposefully stimulate their children's language development and their motivation to learn through appropriate utilization of day-to-day experiences. The presentation included the use of materials that were inexpensive and easily obtainable. A minimum of commercial materials was used (see Appendix A). Discussion of the presentation was encouraged as well as the sharing of anecdotes by the mothers about their experiences with the children at home. For example, at snack time the teacher discussed the various ways in which a child's understanding of the concept of fruit could be expanded by a mother's calling attention to its shape, color, size and taste.

In planning the program, assumptions were made that the mothers did not give much thought to their impact on their children's language development, that they were not using their language interaction to facilitate purposefully the cognitive growth of their children, and that they would use suggestions for improving upon their interaction. The general aim of the program was to help the participants become more skillful as teachers of their children (see Appendix B). The program was projected to develop from concrete to abstract and from simple to complex in method of presentation, in ideas presented, and in demands made upon the participants. The first tasks assigned for home application were planned to assure success in order to help maintain the initial attractiveness of the program to the participants. An example was the bringing in of magazine pictures that could be utilized in book construction. More demanding tasks were assigned as the group seemed willing and able to accept them. During discussion, questions were posed at first to elicit responses about familiar experiences and common knowledge. Gradually questions were posed to determine the opinions of the mothers and their understanding of previously presented materials, and to evaluate the manner in which individuals assimilated the information given them. The teacher acted the part of a mother in role-playing sessions to give behavior and language models for participants. Discussion sheets were prepared to assist the mothers in observing child development in the nursery school and at home. At the conclusion of each lesson each mother was given a sheet which reviewed what had been discussed, with suggestions for mother-child activities to do at home. These review

sheets were the means by which the mothers were expected to implement the program. Actions to share with the child were based on the experiences a mother and child commonly engaged in every day. From these routine patterns, expansion was made to learning from toys, games, books, and other experiences in the environment. The goal of the parent program was utilization by mothers of incidental learning opportunities throughout the day as well as during a regular daily sharing time for mothers and child. Information about how a child learns included his needs for encouragement and practice in verbalization, for experiencing through several senses, for success, for consistency and order in his environment, and for new things to be demonstrated as well as talked about.

The objective of the children's nursery program was to provide experiences in an environment that fostered cognitive, perceptual, and language development with positive effects. A kindergarten room filled with a wide assortment of materials and equipment was used. The pre-school teacher was assisted by three aides whom she directed through weekly planning meetings and daily guidance as necessary. The program was based on a child's needs for order and predictability, an alternating pace, mediated experiences, a sense of success, a general language facility, and control of sense organs in attending.

With one exception all the children showed increasing ability to adjust and make use of the nursery school experience. The one child who did not adjust screamed and cried hysterically when his mother was not in the room with him. He could be calmed by being held and cradled like an infant, but his repeated screaming had a very disruptive influence on

the other children and the staff. His mother could not become involved in the adult focused activities when her child cried. Her frustration as well as the inability of the staff to begin techniques other than holding to help him become more comfortable in the setting led her to drop out of the program.

Five of the two-year-old subjects attended at least six times. Gradual improvement was noted in the following areas: adjustment to the 2 1/2 hours in the Center, including being in the nursery room without their mothers; adjustment to a routine schedule and interest in novel experiences; social development while seeking and organizing their own play activities; language performance as stimulated by adults, peers and new experiences; ability to attend to activities and use materials appropriately; and ability to enjoy participating in group activities. The changes manifested in language usage were of particular interest. Initially, they seemed to have poorly developed language skills but, as they became more accustomed to the Center, they revealed greater language ability than had been evident in the pre-test setting.

The mothers who came regularly generally enjoyed themselves at the Center. Those who came most often spoke of how nice it was to have some place to go, to get out of the house and to have a place where the children could play. Two participants were very unhappy over the poor attendance of other mothers and felt that an ultimatum should be issued to them: "Either come or drop out and let someone else have the opportunity." They wanted the Center to be run daily and wished that it could continue throughout the year. They appreciated the opportunity to learn sewing

skills, but there was great variation in their capacity to make use of lessons because of educational handicaps. They generally had short attention spans, poor reading abilities and a limited capacity to persevere in a given task. One participant was very goal directed; she was able to comprehend easily and worked with a minimum of direction. With this exception the behavior of the mothers was adolescent in nature. They evidenced extremes of mood and social behavior (solemnness, passivity, gaiety, eagerness, shyness). They tested the instructor and teased one another. A favorite subject was their dating behavior. Suggestions that their various friendships would soon lead to the birth of another child out of wedlock were frequent. "You're doing the same thing anybody else is!" was a favorite comment. There was a give-and-take in their conversations which often had a blustery quality. This behavior seemed to be a basis for commonality between key group members. Perhaps this was their means for getting to know one another and for testing the reactions of those in charge of the program. At the end of the program two mothers who had good records of attendance and participation were expecting babies during the spring of 1969.

In conducting a program for a group similarly composed, one should expect a broad range of behaviors. An extreme example of a group member's behavior is presented for illustration.

> One day Mrs. H. arrived carrying her portable TV set in one hand and holding on to her little girl's hand with the other. She giggled and explained that she either had to remain at home to "watch her story or bring the set with her to the Center." She stated her position in a haughty way with a kind of determination in her manner. She was immediately told that it would be distracting to have the set on during the

> instructional phases of the program. She felt that she could turn the volume down and just look at the picture. She then tried to get group consensus for what she wanted to do and stated that it was their program and they could do what they wanted to do. She was told by the group leader that if she felt it necessary to look at her story, she could take her TV set into the adjoining room and join us when it was over. This did not please her as she "wanted to be in on everything," her TV program and her sewing lesson. Failing to gain support from the group leader or group members, she relented and did not turn the television set on. She was absent the next time but did return to the group after missing one session.

This 27-year-old mother had six children and additionally took care of five neighborhood children. She did stand to gain from the information being presented in the child focused part of the program as well as the sewing lessons. Though she had a challenging manner and presented somewhat of a problem in this situation, the group leader felt it was necessary to act decisively in response to her attitude but to try to be affirmative and supportive at the same time.

It is very easy to become frustrated with such individuals and to attribute their behavior to a lack of interest or a generally willful determination to have their own way. However, if the behavior is viewed as a response to an unfamiliar situation and an attempt to determine what kinds of norms can be developed, it can be handled in a much more appropriate way. This mother did not like having her wishes frustrated but was able to accept the position of the director and the group, and continue.

Table 3 depicts the judgment of the writers regarding the overall group responses to the program. Eight areas were considered important in rating the degree to which goals were achieved for each member. Attendance was rated according to the number of days each member was present.

Table 3

Rating[1] of Subject Response to Parent-Child Center

ITEMS[2]	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Mrs. Brooks	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1
Mrs. S. Camp	2	3	3	2	1	3	1	4
Mrs. M. Holmes	1	4	4	3	3	3	1	3
Miss M. Mason	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4
Miss D. Parks	3	1	2	4	4	3	4	4
Miss E. Peach	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Miss V. Taylor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mrs. B. Wilson	2	2	2	4	4	4	2	3
Mrs. D. Lawson	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Miss A. Miller	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

[1]Rating identification: Very good - 1
Good - 2
Fair - 3
Poor - 4

[2]Item identification:
1 = Attendance
2 = Appropriate behavior in Center
3 = Attention to instructor
4 = Discussion of content presented
5 = Sharing of anecdotal information
6 = Following through on assignments
7 = Enjoyment
8 = Degree program goals attained

Appropriate Center behavior referred to the amount of constructive or attentive behavior in general in contrast to distractive behavior. Some members whispered, left the room, and made deliberate attempts to provoke others. Paying attention to the instructor during brief presentations was considered important because an assumption was made that a basic amount of information was needed in order for them to achieve the goals of the program. Discussion of content, sharing of experiences, and following through on assignments were considered ways of demonstrating that they were making use of the information that was being provided. The amount of enjoyment they received from their participation was considered important for overall program attractiveness. While there was a general format followed daily, the program was implemented flexibly. Snacks were provided and an informal atmosphere prevailed. Effort was made to maximize their comfort in the Center.

There was consensus between the teacher and social worker that the program goals were achieved with three of the participants. The success with the three individuals seemed related to their high attendance level, manner of participation, and interest in continuing the program. One participant who dropped out because of her child's behavior and one who became employed on a full-time basis probably would have been able to achieve the goals if they had continued to attend. Goals seemed to have been achieved with the members who had the best attendance.

An attempt was made to discover why attendance was not better. Two welfare pay days fell on the days that the Center was in operation, and the participants had an established routine of buying food and paying bills

on pay day. In addition to this, children's illnesses frequently interfered with the mothers' attendance and three people seemed basically uninterested in the group once they found what it was all about. Apparently the reinforcers provided by the program were less salient than those provided elsewhere.

Conclusion

Multiple factors have to be considered in planning a Parent-Child Center for low-income mothers and children. First, separated or unwed mothers might not be able or willing to participate in a Center. Though it would seem that the presence of young preschool children in the home would suggest that a mother would want to take advantage of a nursery school program, it was found that many other factors interfered with participation or took precedence over their involvement in such a program. This may be more true in an urban setting than a rural one. A program for this particular population might best be held in the neighborhoods where there could be an open door policy and where the Center could operate on a continuous basis. The unfamiliarity of the Parent-Child Center setting and the time restrictions on the Center's operation appeared to be factors inhibiting success of the program.

The Parent-Child Center was a totally new concept in this community and, therefore, one should not expect immediate acceptance or participation on a large scale. Much time is apparently needed before sufficient motivation can be developed. An agency or institution (such as the Welfare Department) that is currently providing one kind of service to a given

group is probably in a better position to develop a Parent-Child Center than one that has no existing entree into the lives of the parents.

Once a group is composed, a wide range of behavior can be expected. Careful attention will need to be given to group composition as it can influence the development (or lack of development) of the group. Where the purposes and values of the program are abstract or unfamiliar, a certainnumber of dropouts can be expected, as well as a resistance to new ideas. Inappropriate behavior on the part of adults can be interpreted as an attempt to test out or discover the boundaries or limitations set, as well as the reactions of the program leaders.

The children from a disadvantaged community will vary in their responses to the usual nursery program. Some will be eager but many will show a reluctance and need a great deal of support to begin using the materials or expressing themselves. A nursery class that has a great deal of equipment and materials is likely to have an initially overwhelming influence on children who have no previous experience in such a setting.

What might appear to be a lack of language facility in a young disadvantaged preschool child during the first meeting, might be more a cautious approach to a strange environment and in no way should be taken as an indication of a child's actual ability. A child may remain reticent until he is less apprehensive in the new setting. Thus, a major advantage of participation in the Center was the opportunity for young children to learn that there are places outside their homes where they can safely express themselves. Likewise, there are adults outside of their family group to whom they can relate.

The evaluation measures that were selected were useful primarily in giving clues about the appropriateness of the program to the mothers. They also provided information about the characteristics of members of the group. Due to poor attendance, the short duration of the study, the absence of control group data and post-tests on the Caldwell and Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, the measures used were not useful in making a summative evaluation of the program.

The program activities selected were judged to be appropriate for the two groups. On the basis of this experience, the inclusion of activities that gave mothers a chance to learn skills as well as gain information seemed very important. The participants showed an interest in learning specific skills and to a lesser extent in acquiring information about children's development that would be useful for them. Giving the mothers an opportunity to say what was meaningful to them appeared especially important. Had the program focused exclusively on the children, it is likely that attendance would have been poorer than it was. The group as a whole tended to view child care responsibilities primarily as a chore. In trying to add a dimension of fun or reward and in trying to emphasize the learning aspect, a new value orientation was presented but it was met with skepticism. The attraction that sewing had for the members apparently helped to sustain their attendance. It also gave greater credence to the assumption that mothers in disadvantaged circumstances can benefit from non-traditional opportunities to learn. Parents with educational handicaps are limited in their abilities to provide enriching experiences for their children. Not only do they

frequently lack financial resources, but they also lack knowledge of how to make use of community resources. They lack motivation, as well. It is in the latter two areas that a Parent-Child Center could possibly be effective with proper planning, financial support, location, and staffing.

Appendix A

Activities and Materials Used in the Mothers' Group

Toys brought from home
Scrap books from magazine pictures
Stories written about the child
Finger plays
Songs
Fruit tasting party
Touch bag with different types of items
Cloth book for touching
Felt covered cans with rice, beans, marbles
Collections of things gathered on walks
Booklets of circles and squares
Rhythm instruments made from bells, oatmeal boxes, filled cans
Play dough

<u>Commercial Toys</u>:

Puzzles
Books
Nesting blocks
Pop beads
Stringing beads
Sorting post office box

Appendix B

Outline of Content for Mothers' Program

I. Language and Auditory Discrimination: An interaction process

A. Language

1. Initiated

a. Labeling: things, actions, feelings
b. Describing attributes: size, color, shape, other sensory
c. Relating: comparing according to difference and sameness with different variables
d. Categorizing
e. Differentiating
f. Generalizing

2. Elicited

a. Passive language: understanding evidenced by responding to commands and requests
b. Expressive jargon: trying to speak. Learning linguistic modes of behavior
c. One-word utterances: Interjections: hi, bye, no
Denominations: naming objects
Commands: Eat! Milk! Out!
d. Combination of words into utterances: first two, then three, four, etc. "Boy. Running." Learning syntax, learning a way for constructing formulations. Adult hears meaning, not actually what is said.
e. Inner speech
f. Parallel thought development

B. Auditory Discrimination

1. Initiated

a. Listening: can repeat what child says in more complete or accurate form
b. Questioning: give alternatives which require a verbal response; answer questions (rhetorical) if he can't
c. Conversation: recall what he has just done, read

2. Elicited

a. Understanding of words
b. Identifying various sources of sounds: people, animals, objects, musical instruments, vehicles, and machines
c. Identifying conditions of sound: soft, loud, high, low, quiet, noisy

II. Actions: with child and from child (ways to stimulate children)

A. Parallel activities: You work, he plays, household items, self and clothes, toys

B. Cooperative play: Play with toys he has; take up on what he brings you

C. Participating in routine of day: Share an activity in setting table, making lunch, eating, bedtime, songs and fingerplays, imitating your actions

D. Verbal activities: Making up games, reading books

E. Environmental interactions: Supermarket, mailbox, walks, people, machines outdoors, games, friends, relatives

F. Establishing routine teaching patterns: Regular time each day to read or play together

III. Understanding needs of children

A. Need for a language model: Mother provides model for words, sentences, articulation. Language precursor to thought

B. Needs for practice in talking

C. Needs for encouragment and praise for verbal attempts

D. Needs for demonstration of new expectation as well as of verbal directions

E. Need to experience widely

F. Needs for success experiences to build up positive self concept. Mother needs to observe what child can handle and understand so she can provide him with success experiences.

G. Needs for consistency and order in the environment

H. Needs for focused stimulation

References

Caldwell, B. Inventory of home stimulation instructions. Children's Center, Upstate Medical Center, State University of New York, Syracuse, New York. (Presented at American Psychological Association meeting, New York City, September 1966.)

Chilman, C. Growing up poor. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Welfare Administration, 1966.

Dunn, L. M. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Minneapolis, Minnesota: American Guidance Service, Inc., 1965.

Gordon, I. J. Early childhood stimulation through parent education. University of Florida, April 1968. (mimeographed)

Hess, R., & Shipman, V. Early experiences and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, XXXVI, 1965, 869-886.

Horton, D. M. A training program for mothers, DARCEE, Nashville, Tennessee, 1966. (mimeographed)

Levenstein, P., & Sunley, R. Aiding cognitive growth in disadvantaged preschoolers. Progress report, Family Service Association of Nassau County, Mineola, New York, February 1968.

Mathis, H. Environmental participation index manual. Psychometric Studies, Washington, D. C., October 1967.

Schaeffer, E. Intellectual stimulation of culturally deprived infants, National Institute of Mental Health, Chevy Chase, Maryland, 1965. (mimeographed)

Wasik, B. H. A behavior classification of teacher's verbal and nonverbal interaction, Durham, North Carolina: Education Improvement Program, Duke University, 1968. (mimeographed)